



COM/KDL/vhj 10/21/2026

FILED

10/21/26

10:47 AM

62606024

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Delia Lovell,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Gas Company
(U904G),

Defendant.

Case 26-06-024

(NOT CONSOLIDATED)

Delia Lovell,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company
(U338E),

Defendant.

Case 26-07-006

SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

This scoping memo and ruling sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope these two related proceedings pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

1. Background

Delia Lovell (Complainant) filed formal complaints against the gas service provider Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) and electric service provider Southern California Edison Company (SCE) on June 23, 2026 and July 7, 2026 respectively.¹ Case (C.) 26-06-024 against SoCalGas and C.26-07-006 against SCE allege the utilities issued fraudulent bills, illegally disconnected service, and failed to produce accurate billing records, causing substantial harm. As SoCalGas and SCE are separate utility companies, the cases are independent in their legal bases. Because the cases are factually connected, and because the Complainant alleges a coordinated pattern of misconduct by the two utilities, the cases are being conducted in tandem.²

In C.26-06-024, Complainant disputes an outstanding gas bill amount of \$5,381.83 as of September 2025 and seeks relief in the amount of \$11,958.23. In C.26-07-006, Complainant disputes an outstanding electric bill amount of \$14,241.63 as of April 23, 2026 and seeks relief in the amount of \$1.343 million.

In both cases, Complainant requests that SoCalGas and SCE restore service, produce billing records, reflect both accounts as paid in full and in good standing, and provide the relief requested. Additionally, Exhibit E to both complaints states Complainant has been permanently disabled since 2016.

On August 4, 2026, SoCalGas filed an initial Answer to C.26-06-024. With permission from the assigned ALJ, SoCalGas filed an Amended Answer on August 26, 2026.

¹ Although SoCalGas and SCE provide utility service to the same address, the companies are separate entities and thus require separate proceedings.

² C. 26-06-024 was originally calendared on an expedited timeline. In order to conduct the cases in tandem, on August 13, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling converting C.26-06-024 from an expedited complaint to a regular complaint.

SCE filed its Answer to C.26-07-006 on August 16, 2026.

On August 31, 2026, a prehearing conference was held in both cases to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary. After considering the Complaints, Answers, and discussions at the prehearing conference, I have determined the issues and initial schedule of the proceedings to be set forth in this scoping memo.

Given the Complainant's disability, the Commission has determined that an environmental and social justice issue has been raised under Goal 6.1 and 6.3. This proceeding will be conducted in light of the environmental and social justice issues raised.

2. Issues in C.26-06-024

The issues to be determined or otherwise considered in C.26-06-024 are:

1. Were the bills charged to the Complainant for their gas usage accurate? If not, identify each monthly bill with an error and the amount of the alleged error.
2. Did SoCalGas conduct its collection efforts in accordance with its rules, policies, and best practices generally, and specifically with regard to:
 - a) Disconnection of Service
 - b) Arrearage Management Program
3. Did Complainant comply with the rules of the Arrearage Management Program?
4. What impacts, if any, do the billing and collection actions of SoCalGas have on environmental and social justice communities and the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan?
5. Should C.26-06-024 be dismissed?

3. Issues in C.26-07-006

1. Were the bills charged to the Complainant for their electricity usage accurate? If not, identify each monthly bill with an error and the amount of the alleged error.
2. Did SCE conduct its collection efforts in accordance with its rules, policies, and best practices generally, and specifically with regard to:
 - a) Disconnection of Service
 - b) Arrearage Management Program
3. Did Complainant comply with the rules of the Arrearage Management Program?
4. What impacts, if any, do the billing and collection actions of SCE have on environmental and social justice communities and the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan?
5. Should C.26-07-006 be dismissed?

4. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

Issue numbers one and two in both matters are contested, material issues of fact; accordingly, we will allow parties to present evidence on these issues and evidentiary hearings are needed.

5. Schedule

The following schedule is adopted here for both complaints and may be modified by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the complaints:

Event	Date
Meet and confer, held	On or before October 30, 2026
Deadline to complete discovery	November 2, 2026

Joint Status Update, served	On or before November 4, 2026
Remote status conference, held	November 6, 2026
Remote evidentiary hearing, held	November 10, 2026
Briefs filed and served	TBD
Presiding officer decision, issued	No later than 60 days after submission
Commission decision, issued	No sooner than 30 days after Presiding officer decision

The proceedings will stand submitted upon closing statements or alternatively upon the filing of briefs, unless the ALJ requires further evidence or argument. Based on this schedule, the proceedings will be resolved within 12 months as required by Public Utilities Code Section 1701.2(i).

6. Access to Status Conference and Evidentiary Hearing

This Ruling sets remote status conferences for both complaints for November 6, 2026, commencing at 1 o'clock in the afternoon. This Ruling sets remote evidentiary hearings for both complaints for November 10, 2026, commencing at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

The status conferences and evidentiary hearings shall be held virtually via Webex. Parties shall be prepared to have video feed for the evidentiary hearing. If a party is unable to access video for the evidentiary hearing, they must request permission from the assigned Administrative Law Judge in advance of the evidentiary hearing to appear otherwise.

Status Conference Access for C.26-06-024 and C.26-07-006

Webex link:

<https://cpuc.webex.com/cpuc/j.php?MTID=m608bdb34ea0b92e59b5da01239a543da>

Meeting number:

2499 265 4005

Meeting passcode:

32srPmJifJ4

Telephone numbers for backup audio, if necessary: 1-855-282-6330 (toll free), or 1-415-655-0002.

Evidentiary Hearing Access C.26-06-024 and C.26-07-006

Webex link:

<https://cpuc.webex.com/cpuc/j.php?MTID=ma8254766d00bb7ffcc9cef095fbb2e39>

Meeting number:

2487 679 8907

Meeting passcode:

pPtkmArw732

Telephone numbers for backup audio, if necessary: 1-855-282-6330 (toll free), or 1-415-655-0002.

7. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements

The Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program offers mediation, early neutral evaluation, and facilitation services, and uses ALJs who have been trained as neutrals. At the parties' request, the assigned ALJ can refer the proceedings to the Commission's ADR Coordinator. Additional ADR information is available on the Commission's website.³

³ <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>

Any settlements between parties, whether regarding all or some of the issues, shall comply with Article 12 of the Rules and shall be served in writing. Such settlements shall include a complete explanation of the settlement and a complete explanation of why it is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law and in the public interest. The proposing parties bear the burden of proof as to whether the settlement should be adopted by the Commission.

8. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions

The Commission determined that these are adjudicatory proceedings.⁴ Accordingly, ex parte communications are prohibited pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

9. Public Advisor

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/about-cpuc/divisions/news-and-public-information-office/public-advisors-office> or contact the Commission's Public Advisor at 866-849-8390 or 866-836-7825 (TTY), or send an e-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

10. Filing, Service, and Service List

The official service lists has been created and is on the Commission's website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service lists is

⁴ Instructions to Answer/OII at page.

correct and serve notice of any errors on the Commission's Process office, the service list, and the ALJ. Persons may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4.⁵

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the current official service list on the Commission's website.

These proceedings will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. Parties to these proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceedings may contact the Process Office at process_office@cpuc.ca.gov to request addition to the "Information Only" category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

The Commission encourages those who seek information-only status on the service list to consider the Commission's subscription service as an alternative. The subscription service sends individual notifications to each subscriber of formal e-filings accepted by the Commission. Notices sent through subscription service are less likely to be flagged by spam or other filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

⁵ The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpsc.ca.gov/-/media/cpsc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>

**11. Receiving Electronic Service
from the Commission**

Parties and other persons on the service lists are advised that it is the responsibility of each person or entity on the service list for Commission proceedings to ensure their ability to receive emails from the Commission. Please add “@cpuc.ca.gov” to your email safe sender list and update your email screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of emails from the Commission.

12. Assignment of Proceeding

Karen Douglas is the assigned commissioner and Camille Watts-Zagha is the assigned Administrative Law Judge for these proceedings.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of these proceedings is described above and is adopted.
2. The schedule of these proceedings is set forth above and is adopted.
3. Evidentiary hearing is needed.
4. The presiding officer is Administrative Law Judge Camille Watts-Zagha.

Dated October 21, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ KAREN DOUGLAS

Karen Douglas
Assigned Commissioner